

Questions Received in Response to RFP B2Z10003 EECBG

State of MO – DNR

1.	Will the agency be paying for the services in this RFP strictly within the 10% admin funding limit in the DOE FOA, or does it interpret these services to include direct program costs and therefore can exceed the 10% admin limit?
2.	Does the agency plan to subgrant only 60% of its EECBG grant (\$7.54 million) or a larger fraction, and if larger, what percentage?
3.	Does the agency anticipate setting a cap or a floor for the subgrant amounts?
4.	While the DOE FOA includes a wide range of eligible activities, some of these will not be feasible for many smaller governments, so would the agency consider a substantially smaller list of funding uses?
5.	Section 1.3.3 indicates that at least 60 percent of funds received will go to Missouri cities other than the 17 most populous and Missouri counties other than the 10 most populous. In the pre-proposal teleconference, Missouri indicated that 10 percent of the funds will go to administration. Would you provide an estimate of the percent of administrative costs that will be dedicated to use by State of Missouri? How will the remaining 30 percent of the funds be used? Will any funds be used to provide subgrants to the 17 most populous cities and 10 most populous counties in the state
6.	Section 2.1.9 (b) indicates that the contractor shall be responsible for passing through EECBG funding from the MDNR-EC to subgrantees. Will the contractor be responsible for paying the subgrantees and then requesting reimbursement from Missouri, or will contractor merely coordinate requests for reimbursement to be paid by Missouri
7.	Section 3.1.2 states that the entire proposal will be considered an open record. Presumably this includes the cost section of the proposal. Can any part of the cost proposal be submitted confidentially
8.	If a contractor is selected to complete this work, will they be eligible to respond to later RFP's to implement some of the resulting projects? For instance do energy audits
9.	Please provide specifics regarding the pass-through process and/or documentation of "MDNR General Terms and Conditions for Federal Subgrantees" per para. 2.1.9 b.
10.	Regarding 2.1.8 (a),...The 175 day timeline doesn't appear to be consistent with the milestones identified in the prior sections. As an example, in 2.1.7 (180) days are provided for awarding the subgrant. However, 2.1.8 has an earlier timeline than 2.1.7, yet that timeline is based on the award of the subgrant, which in theory may not have occurred if the full timeframe in 2.1.7 is exercised.
11.	Regarding 2.1.9 (b)....Can you clarify the "passing-through" contractor EECBG funding responsibilities. While 2.1.9 (f) gives some guidance as to indirect/3rd party responsibilities for the contractor regarding invoicing and money transfers, we want to verify that the contractor has no fiduciary responsibilities directly associated with financial transfers and funding by the subgrantee entity.
12.	Please also review para. 2.1.7 regarding contractor's fiduciary responsibilities.